UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Exploding the Niemoeller Myth - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

A Problem in Tolerance - *Gerald F. Weary*

Appeasement and Jewish Emancipation - - - - - - - - *David M. Bloch*

Challenge - - - - *Randall S. Hilton*

VOLUME CXXXI NUMBER 7

Chicago, September, 1945

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of The Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

David M. Bloch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Homer A. Jack: Executive Secretary of the Chicago Council Against Religious and Racial Discrimination.

Basanta Koomar Roy: Former Extension Lecturer of the University of Wisconsin; author of *Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry.*

Gerald F. Weary: Formerly minister of the Unitarian Church of Bloomington, Illinois; now minister of the Unitarian Church in Port Washington, New York.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 99
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 102

ARTICLES—

Exploding the Niemoeller Myth—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 102
A Problem in Tolerance—GERALD F. WEARY 104
Appeasement and Jewish Emancipation—DAVID M. BLOCH 108

THE STUDY TABLE—

Complex Problem—HOMER A. JACK 110
Lanny Budd's Program—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 110

CORRESPONDENCE—

Plan for Peace Between India and Britain—BASANTA KOOMAR ROY 111

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS—

Challenge—RANDALL S. HILTON 112

THE FIELD—

Religious Freedom Case—*Civil Liberties News* 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Religious Freedom Case

Last March the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee was asked to find a lawyer who would represent Mrs. Vashti McCollum, 1118 W. John St., Champaign, Ill., in a legal suit to protect religious freedom for herself and all Americans. The Committee and the Chicago Action Council joined in retaining Landon Lincoln Chapman, counsel for the Committee, as attorney for Mrs. McCollum and the civil liberties principle involved.

A written demand was served upon the School Board, and upon its failure to comply a petition for mandamus was filed June 11 to secure a court order to stop sectarian religious instruction in the public schools during school hours. On July 5 Judge Frank B. Leonard of Champaign overruled the motion of the School Board attorney to quash the petition on the ground that the court had no jurisdiction. The School Board was given until July 30 to answer and it indicated that a motion to strike (in the nature of a demurrer) would be filed. On July 30 Judge Leonard gave the defendant until August 10 to file its answer and set the case for trial at Urbana, Sept. 10.

So "The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. Vashti McCollum vs. Board of Education of School District 71, Champaign County, Illinois" becomes the first major test case of the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee. Judge Leonard considers the issue of such importance that he has asked Judge Grover C. Watson of Farmer City, Ill., and Judge Martin E. Worthland of Decatur, Ill., the other two judges of the sixth judicial circuit of Illinois, to sit with him and the decision of the majority will be the decision of the court. If the court issues a writ of mandamus to the School Board directing it to prohibit the teaching of religion in the public schools by private teachers during school hours, the religious bodies concerned have arranged to support an appeal to the state and then the federal Supreme Court.

The Interchurchmen's Council of Champaign, consisting of the clergy and prominent laymen of the larger Protestant churches, has for almost five years employed private teachers, and by arrangement with the School Board caused these teachers to give sectarian religious instruction from the fourth through the eighth grade. Two religious teachers are kept busy almost every period teaching religious doctrine consistent with certain Protestant Christian creeds so that every class has a half-hour period of such religious instruction each week. These periods of religious instruction take place during the regular school hours and the private religious instructor takes over a classroom and displaces the regular secular curriculum.

Mrs. McCollum had refused to give her son permission to take the religious edu-

(*Continued on page* 110)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXI SEPTEMBER, 1945 No. 7

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

San Francisco, Potsdam, Russia's entrance into the Asiatic war, the sudden peace negotiations with Japan, how the events piled up in August! But none of them all seemed important but the atomic bomb. In one dread instant the line between damage and destruction, the threshhold leading to out-and-out annihilation, had been crossed. Step by step, from the invention of gunpowder to the making of the block-buster, we have been advancing in our control of explosive power. Now, at one prodigious leap, we have attained the apex of our desire—the power to wipe out utterly the works of man and eventually man himself. As I read that fateful story of the $2,000,000,000 bombs dropped upon Japan, everything else seemed suddenly to become insignificant. I seemed to grow cold, as though I had been transported to the waste spaces of the moon. The summer beauty seemed to vanish, and the waves of the sea to be pounding upon the shores of an empty world. If there were those who could feel any interest in common things, even the end of the war, I was not among them. For I knew that the final crisis in human history had come. What that atomic bomb had done to Japan, it could do to us. President Truman is sincere and honorable, I have no doubt, in pledging this country to keep the secret of this diabolic contrivance, but what has been thus so terribly proclaimed is no secret. In science as in politics, there is no isolation any more. No nation, like no man, liveth unto itself. Whether we like it or not, we are all one, to live, or die, together. The fate of mankind, therefore, is now hanging in the balance. Can we get rid of war? The idea that we will get rid of it through terror of the bomb, I have no faith in at all. The ghastly thing about this bomb is that it was released not by Hitler in some mad mania of lust, but by sane and good men who knew what it could do. *Our* leaders, the leaders of the United Nations, the self-appointed custodians of civilization, were the ones to strike this blow which is not only the supreme atrocity of the ages, but the greatest single threat to civilization that man has ever known. For the sake of an immediate advantage, the ending of the war against Japan, these men let loose this horror upon mankind. And what these did today, others in like circumstances will do tomorrow. No, we need a nobler motive, a higher statesmanship, than fear, to save mankind from a final holocaust. And that is what makes San Francisco and Potsdam look so frail and feeble in the face of such dire extremity. It is later than we think! Will we awake, and act, in time?

II

The Boston *Traveler* has published the following editorial:

> On Wednesday the *Traveler* echoed a question which many people are asking. Is the use of so terrific a weapon as the atomic bomb morally justified?
>
> If it speeds the end of the war, if the instantaneous obliteration of massed Jap personnel and material means, over the entire course of the war, fewer deaths, less suffering and smaller damage, then its use is justified.
>
> We have every reason to believe that these results will be obtained through the use of the atomic bomb. Therefore its use is justified.

It is this argument that the end justifies the means which is now being accepted as never before in the light of the collapse of Japan. Mothers, fathers, wives, sisters, sweethearts, all who have loved ones in the Pacific or on the way, echo it with rapture—and we do not wonder. The lifting of the grim shadow of death would seem to justify anything. But any objective and all-round attitude must show that this contention is today as great and dangerous a fallacy as ever. In the first place, what followed upon the dropping of the atomic bomb did not alter in the slightest degree its initial horror. It was a crime which we would instantly have recognized as such had Germany and not our own country been guilty of the act. Of course, if the end justifies the means, then there is no such thing as morality at all. Everything that Hitler has done, or might have done, stands justified from his viewpoint, since he also had his end to serve. But putting morals to one side, as our age so easily does, there remains the pragmatic question: What if the bomb did "speed the end of the war"? That is not the end of the story. It is only the first chapter. Whether, from

the practical point of view, this horror is justified, can be determined only when we have read the last chapter of the story. For the atomic bomb is not going to stop here. What if it "speeds the end" not only of this war, but also of civilization? It is the long range view that counts in matters of this kind, and I say that the long range view in this case is a thing to chill the soul. Professor Hooton, of Harvard, sums it all up when he says, "To put into the hands of human beings as irresponsible as apes, and much more malicious, such a weapon as the atomic bomb, is to invite the destruction of civilization and the extinction of the species." No, it is not by such means that humanity is to be saved. In the vast reaches of cosmic time, and in the endless experience of man in life and death, the ending of the Japanese war is a triviality which weighs as nothing in the eternal balances. We are deceived by our own immediate stress of love and agony. Not in this realm of sheer brute force lies the salvation we seek. Let me quote one of the greatest of modern scientists, Dr. Charles Steinmetz:

> I think the greatest discovery will be along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of man and history. Yet we have been merely playing with it and never seriously studied it as we have the social forces. Some day, people will learn that material things do not bring happiness and are of little use in making men creative.
>
> Then the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces which as yet have been hardly scratched. When this day comes the world will advance more in one generation than it has in the past four generations.

III

President Truman seems to be amazingly popular, and his administration to be winning general approval. Quite apart from our own attitude toward his policies, this is to be accounted a good thing, for it is a vindication of democracy, as proving once again the worth of the common man, the ability of the people to produce leaders in any emergency, and the soundness therefore of our constitutional principles of government. Under Mr. Roosevelt we were getting into a bad way in our subserviency to the idea of "the indispensable man." This was the creation at once of party interest and of personal admiration. The late President was not responsible, except as he allowed himself to be used on this basis in his third and fourth campaigns for office. But never was there a conception more dangerous to the pure ideals of democracy. If there was only one man who could be trusted to guide the destinies of this great republic, then was democracy a failure, and the way wide open to Fascism. If we must keep one man indefinitely in office, in lack of any other man among all our millions to take his place, then must the *Fuehrer* principle be recognized as itself indispensable. I said in 1938, and again in 1942, what I would say again now, that there was never any truth in this idea, and that there was nothing more important in our country's life than its emphatic repudiation. Now comes the proof! President Truman is carrying on in good spirit and with admired efficiency. In no place is the nation suffering, or the lack of real leadership being felt. In the last campaign we were told with boresome reiteration that Mr. Roosevelt must be re-elected if only because he and he alone could be trusted to hold his own with Mr. Churchill and Joseph Stalin. Yet Mr. Truman, who had never been farther away from Missouri than Washington, D. C., seemed to get on admirably at Potsdam. There are resources in us all that exceed our expectation. The average man, unknown and untried, can rise to meet the challenge of any emergency. This is our democratic faith, proved by the enlisted man on ship or shore, and by the President in his high office. Never again, as long as this country lasts, will be heard the plea for "the indispensable man." Mr. Truman has demonstrated for all time that no man is indispensable. This unconscious action will perhaps remain his supreme service of the nation.

IV

I sometimes wonder why it is that Soviet Russia is the one subject these days that cannot be discussed without furious controversy and fierce contention. Just mention Stalin or Moscow or the Kremlin, and everybody proceeds to lose his temper. One reason is undoubtedly that we know so little about Russia. With no free interchange of ideas between Russians and Americans, with the Soviets shut off from us almost as completely as the Chinese from Europe in the days of Marco Polo, we are acutely conscious of ignorance, and thus are tempted to exasperation. Another reason is prejudice, which draws its sustenance from ignorance —either prejudice against Russia on the part of those who fear her, or for Russia on the part of those who rejoice in her. This means emotion in place of thought, with resulting antagonism and bad feeling. I remember a Town Meeting of the Air discussion of Russia some months ago which was not a discussion at all, but just one long "spat" from beginning to end. What we need more than anything else in this field is information. Full or even adequate information we are not going to get so long as Russia adheres to her present policy of secrecy and propaganda. But meanwhile there are some helpful sources which are not to be neglected. First among some recent books I would place David J. Dallin's *The Real Soviet Russia,* a work of impeccable integrity, documented beyond all possibility of question or denial. For the moment at least, this book is the last word. Side by side with this, I would put *The Russian Enigma,* by William Henry Chamberlin, who is described by Mr. Dallin as "one of the best if not the best American authority on Russia." And Mr. Chamberlin has just now published a new book, entitled *America: Partner in World Rule,* which contains

chapters on the foreign policies of the U.S.S.R. in Europe and Asia which are indispensable. Added to these is Alexander Barmine's *One Who Survived*. Here is testimony right from the inside, for Mr. Barmine was for years a Bolshevik, a soldier in the Red Army, a diplomat in the Russian foreign service, a product of the Revolution and at last its victim. What wonder that one reviewer of this book has said that "all other books on Russia will taste like ersatz coffee after reading Alexander Barmine's poignant life story." There are other good books on Russia, old and new, but at the present moment these are of prime importance. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that unless one has read these publications named above, one is not competent to discuss the Russian question. Information—that is what we want and need. And here it is!

V

Omar Khayyam has a famous stanza in his *Rubaiyat* about men being

> But helpless Pieces in the Game He plays
> Upon this Chequer-board of Nights and Days;
> Hither and thither moves, and checks, and slays,
> And one by one back in the Closet lays.

I thought of these fateful lines the other day as I pondered what has happened during the last few months in the sudden passing of two of the three great figures of the war on the Allied side. Roosevelt suddenly stricken by death, and Churchill deposed by the most sensational election overturn in English history. "One by one," indeed, "back in the Closet"! It only goes to show how little we can forecast the future, and how helpless are even the mightiest of us all in the hands of fate. Perhaps this may teach us a much needed lesson in humility. These men were fashioning our world for us. They were working on blueprints for a new society which was to endure for generations to come. Theirs was the kingdom and the power and the glory. Then, in one great sweep, so to speak, they are tumbled from the board. It sets one furiously to think! And to wonder if there is any significance in the character of the successors to Roosevelt and Churchill! At first sight, Truman and Attlee seem strangely to be alike. Both stand at the opposite poles of personality from the amazing men whose positions they now so unexpectedly occupy. Thus, they are poor speakers; they have no glamor or brilliancy; they are modest, quiet, unassuming; they claim no great ability, and clutch for no great authority. They are simple men of the people, who would have the people rule. Either man alone might be helpless on the international stage. Together they may lift the curtain on a new drama which may well be beneficent for mankind. In the last war it came to be regarded as a calamity that the men who made the war were the men who made the peace. In this war, by strange strokes of fate, new men come to the fore as the problems of war pass, to give way ever more momentously to the problems of the peace. Stalin may well take notice of the fact. For he is dealing now not merely with new men but with new forces. Let him be mindful that he has no ultimate control of things. Armies do not in the end determine events, nor governments, nor economic forces. "There is a destiny that shapes our ends." Jerome Frank, in his new book, *Faith and Freedom,* calls it accident or chance. Deeper and more philosophical minds call it Fate. The religionist, or mystic, calls it God. But whatever the language, the meaning is the same. There is a power greater than ourselves that makes for man the way that he must go.

VI

It was interesting, and a bit astonishing, to read of the "excommunication" of Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada. I had thought that this excommunication business was a monopoly of Christianity; and also that the business had of late pretty much gone into bankruptcy. The last action of the kind that comes to mind was that directed against Dr. Algernon S. Crapsey, of the Episcopal Church, and that was a good many years ago. Dr. Kaplan is Dean of the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. He ranks as one of the great Jewish scholars of this day. And he is more than a scholar! He is a prophet, as witness his leadership of the Reconstructionist movement in Israel. The charges directed against him by the Orthodox Rabbis are "atheism, heresy, and disbelief in the basic tenets of Judaism." The evidence offered in support of these charges is found, so it is contended, in a *Sabbath Prayer Book,* edited by Dr. Kaplan, which was burned before the Assembly which passed the ban of excommunication. This official adoption by Jews of the Nazi practice of burning books is something solemnly to think about! Dr. Kaplan, who incidentally is not a member of the Union and not an orthodox rabbi, asks pertinently the question as to "how can any one who edits a prayer book be an atheist." He then goes on to explain that his preparation of the book was prompted by a desire to develop a religious service which would give "modern-minded Jews a form of worship in which they could participate with devotion and sincerity." The book was not intended for orthodox but for liberals, and its banning and burning therefore raises the whole question of "freedom of worship." As a faithful reconstructionist, Dr. Kaplan made it plain, in his introduction to his book, that the Jews are not a divinely chosen people, that "the Torah is a human document and thus not supernaturally inspired," and that Jews today can no longer look forward to the advent of a personal Messiah. All this would seem to be a commonplace of contemporary knowledge and intelligent belief. Its challenge by the Orthodox Rabbis is terribly familiar to Christian liberals, and

seems like the opening of an ancient page in their own history. It is the old slogan: No progress in religion! But it seems strange for Jews to indulge in this heresy-hunt. Why, what did Jehovah say to Moses as recorded in the sacred text of the flight of the Children of Israel from the darkness and bondage of Egypt? Did God not say: "Speak unto the Children of Israel, *that they go forward*"?

Jottings

"Mussolini wanted a long war."
Count Ciano's Diary, as quoted in the New York *Times*.

Between *wanting* to have a long war, and *willingness* to have one, there is of course a difference. But it is a small one, especially for the soldiers who have to die.

I sat on a bathing beach this summer watching the bathers, and suddenly I seemed to feel that I understood the Scripture passage about God "from whom no secrets are hid."

If Winston Churchill in his retirement will write a history of this war to match his history of the last war —that glorious masterpiece, *The World Crisis!*—then will his defeat last July be regarded as a blessing without disguise.

The Moscow *Pravda* recently attacked the Vatican for its friendly attitude toward the Nazis during the war, and for preferring its own security to the suffering and danger involved in fighting *"for the freedom of the people, the dignity of man, and religious freedom."* This is indeed deeply touching as coming from Soviet Russia!

F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, P.C., M.P., eminent English Unitarian, is Secretary of State for India in the new Labor Cabinet. Leader of all advanced causes through many years, staunch champion of liberty and justice, Pethick-Lawrence's leadership of the India office is the best augury for India that can be imagined. His succession to Amery is like day coming after night.

Yale has made the sensational discovery that there is such a thing as religion. It proposes to establish in the College a department of religion, to match its departments of literature, history, philosophy, economics, and chemistry. This is good news. Perhaps, who knows, there may be some students who will go to chapel again.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Exploding the Niemoeller Myth

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

Like a long delayed time bomb, the Niemoeller myth is about to be exploded, and recent events, including the liberation of the German cleric from a concentration camp as well as several interviews with him, are hastening the process. If the final detonation should alarm and disturb certain people, they will have only themselves to blame.

It is my desire to clarify the record and to correct certain misconceptions that have prevailed regarding Niemoeller during the ten years in which the Niemoeller myth has been in the making. In the first place, there can be no doubt as to the fact that Martin Niemoeller is a brave man, and I have no intention to detract one iota from his stature as a man of conviction and courage. But to call him a brave man who demonstrated his fearlessness as an Imperial U-Boat commander and later as a *"defensor fidei"* and finally as the inmate of a concentration camp is one thing; to call him a martyr and hero is quite another. If courage and fearlessness evoke our admiration, we should not withhold it even from those millions of Nazis who fought like demons for the cause of National Socialism in Germany, albeit a bad cause. But the high qualities of genuine heroism and martyrdom are not commonly associated with fanaticism and bigotry expended in the service of a bad cause. We expect from our heroes and martyrs some degree of commitment to high ideals and a devotion to truth and decency. Few people of intelligence and conscience will admit that Nazism has in it sufficient elements of truth and high idealism to challenge the spirit of heroism and martyrdom in men. If this is not true, then we should praise and reward, not prosecute and indict, the whole Nazi hierarchy and its *"heiling"* followers. We will agree that the Nazi party members and most German people of the Third Reich were fanatically devoted to Fuehrer and Reich, and many of them have died bravely and defiantly for *"Blut und Boden,"* but were they martyrs and heroes to anyone except their fellow-Nazis?

In the second place, Niemoeller was and is a Nazi. All available evidence points this way, and nothing in either his earlier or later utterances would tend to disprove the charge that ever since the rise of Hitler he has been mentally and spiritually identified with Nazism. Whether he actually was a party member, I do not know, nor does this seem important. What *is* important is the pretty obvious fact that Niemoeller has never clearly and consistently condemned the fundamental doctrines of National Socialism. When has he been known to condemn *Mein Kampf* except in terms

that sound like double-talk? When did he oppose the monstrous pretentions of Nazi ideology regarding Germanism, the supremacy of the Fuehrer, the doctrine of *"Blut und Boden,"* and the pseudo-science of racism? When did he repudiate the utterly un-Christian and inhuman practice of anti-Semitism which reached its hideous climax under the swastika? When did he say a courageous word for Social Democracy, for labor unions, or when did he come to the defense of any liberal attitude in either economics, politics, or religion?

Not even after he had been placed in "protective custody" and had begun his hard years in concentration camps did he utter more than platitudes on behalf of those people who suffered first and most under Hitler, i.e., the Jews and the Poles, and to this day we are patiently waiting to hear from him a clear and forthright repudiation of Nazism and a word of severe judgment upon a people that could so readily fall under the spell of this wicked system. Instead, we hear him talking sentimental banalities, expressing regrets for the fate of his family and people—human, all-too-human, indeed—and from his tired lips comes the pitiful confession that the German people are not ready for democracy; through all his answers in recent interviews we catch a none too carefully disguised mood of impatience, stubbornness, and self-pity. There is nothing in Niemoeller's attitude even today that reveals more than his two books have already shown, viz., the spirit of a *"National-Deutscher"* who still hopes that *"das alte Deutschland"* can be rebuilt and that this "old Germany" may some day again be strong enough to prepare *"der Tag"* of victory and conquest over those enemies that have so decidedly defeated and so thoroughly humiliated it. How else are we to interpret, as one instance of this attitude, Niemoeller's offer in 1939 to resume his services as a U-Boat commander for *"Fuehrer und Vaterland"?*

In the third place, Niemoeller is neither anti-Nazi nor anti-Hitler. This would seem quite adequately proved by the foregoing paragraphs, but it requires further elaboration. So much has been said and written about Niemoeller's opposition to Hitler that the real facts have become obscured. They are really very simple and very clear. Niemoeller did not oppose Hitler nor the pretensions of Nazism when *Mein Kampf* appeared. He did not question nor attack the ruthless policy of National Socialism towards the Weimar Republic; he did not deplore the destruction of the labor unions, nor did he come to the defense of the freedom of press and assembly or of the Jews. He had little or nothing to say against an ideology that from its beginnings was rooted in paganism, in anti-Christian nationalism, and in defiance of all principles of liberty and justice. Nor can his silence and indifference be excused with the convenient refuge to "he didn't know." He was intelligent enough to know, and he *did* know what was going on, and his important position as pastor of the prominent and fashionable church in the Berlin suburb of Dahlen gave him every opportunity to raise his voice in defiance of and in judgment upon a movement, the fatal implications of which anyone of moral insight and spiritual vision could have perceived.

But the important fact to remember is this: Not until Hitler dared to trespass upon the sacred soil of ecclesiastical "special privilege," did Niemoeller begin to protest. He did not assume the rôle of the stern prophet and angry preacher, he did not speak as the roused man of God until the private preserves of traditional ecclesiastical grant and patent had been invaded. Not the danger to the Republic, nor the destruction of popular liberties, nor the cries of tortured, dying, and expatriated Jews touched his conscience and gave fire to his tongue, but the violation of certain "niceties of the relationship of the Fascist state and the Confessional Church" disturbed him and finally brought about the break between him and Hitler. That even Hitler should dare trespass upon certain sacrosanct precincts of the church was the straw that broke the camel's back, and this technical faux pas on the part of the Nazi hierarchy seems to have assumed much greater importance in the eyes of Niemoeller than the rape of the Republic, the violation of the rights of the workers, the annihilation of hundreds of thousands of Jews, and a policy of aggression against weak and peaceful peoples. As Niemoeller himself is said to have put it, he was asked to say *"Heil Hitler"* to God, and he gagged at that. All honor to him for this show of courage and stubborn resistance; but there were others, of less important station in church and state, among Catholic priests and confessional pastors who acted likewise, many of whom have died unknown and unsung in concentration camp and torture chamber. It remained for Martin Niemoeller, former U-Boat commander, popular preacher, and devout Nazi to the end, to be crowned hero, to have woven about his brow the halo of martyrdom, and to have created about his person the myth of an anti-Nazi and anti-Hitler leader.

The record is clear that Niemoeller has courage and conviction; it is equally clear that his principles are not beyond suspicion and that his courage has been very tardy in demonstrating its mettle and very limited in the field of its operation. Today we have nothing, absolutely nothing, to make us change our opinion of the man Niemoeller. It appears beyond doubt that Niemoeller was and still is a Nazi, that not a fundamental aversion to the primitive paganism of Hitlerism caused his break with party and chief but simply the fact that the Fuehrer had overreached himself in his demands upon the church, demands which even the faithful Nazi pastor felt he could not tolerate. How tender and responsive the conscience of Niemoeller is, may be judged from the length of time it took him to realize whither Germany was drifting under Nazism.

Not even Dr. Leo Stein's well-intended but over-simplified and over-sentimentalized book, *I Was in Hell with Niemoeller,* can substantially change or significantly qualify the picture we have of Niemoeller, the pastor, the soldier, the citizen, and the man, a picture toward the outlines and details of which certain simple facts contribute much more than do the adulation of fashionable parishioners and the unthinking praise of admiring colleagues. Nor is there any new light shed upon Niemoeller's character by recent events.

In the fourth place and finally, it appears very clearly that Niemoeller remains today fundamentally unchanged in outlook and disposition. In a clever paragraph, Milton Mayer refers to the German cleric as "a poor, misguided, malevolent stick of a man, but still a man." This is, I feel, expressing the truth in unnecessarily unkind words, but the bitter truth regarding Niemoeller would surely indicate what a grievous error it would be to assume that the former Pastor of Dahlen is proper material for leadership in a reconstituted Germany which we hope to see rebuilt along social-democratic lines. It would also be a mistake to bring him to America and to have the German people "cash in" on the sentimental

reception accorded one who, whatever he may deserve, does certainly not rank the rôle of hero and saint. We do not need to have paraded before our eyes the wreck of a man, the shadowy image of a "what-might-have-been," the pathetic caricature of a martyr-saint. Interviews with Niemoeller have revealed him as a disillusioned and confused, if not embittered, old man; hardly the type of man a defeated and humiliated Germany needs to lead it back to self-respect and to normal intercourse with other nations; nor dare we look for qualities of real leadership in one who appears to trust neither his own people nor himself and who in a day of revolutionary changes and radical readjustments can speak only in the patois of an outmoded and antiquated *"Lebensanschauung."*

Those of us who are looking for strong and promising leadership in Germany can only hope that those in authority, politically and ecclesiastically, may from now on leave Pastor Niemoeller alone. I doubt whether he has it within himself to rise at any future date to real heights of heroic character and spiritual leadership, not to speak of authority in his own country. He has, however, deserved rest and an opportunity for recuperation and reorientation. Why harass the poor man any further? Why insist on pressing the painful crown of thorns of undeserved sainthood on his brow and labeling him with an unwanted *"Ecce Homo"?* History has a way of laying her fingers on her favored sons and selecting them for positions of leadership and public recognition. I do not believe that Niemoeller will win such an accolade from history.

As to bringing him to America—to what purpose? We have, as it is, too many spiritual invalids, too many pseudo-prophets, and too many plaster-saints in our midst already. Let us leave Niemoeller to a happy and deserved oblivion!

A Problem In Tolerance

GERALD F. WEARY

I realize that the discussion of another man's religion is distasteful to many of us and that we would do almost anything to avoid it. The reason for this is that we are good Americans, that is to say we are people who take seriously the significance of religious freedom. We regard this freedom as a precious possession, and we rightly sense that unless all are secure in it none can be secure.

At bottom this belief in religious freedom rests upon our respect for the dignity and worth of human personality. It is right, we say, that men should be free to arrive at their own beliefs, should hold them, and should accept responsibility for them. Their dignity as human beings demands it. We may believe that the beliefs they hold are wrong, still we would say they should be tolerated, and we would say they should be tolerated because we believe it is important that men be free to make up their own minds as to what they are to believe. That is why we call tolerance a spiritual good. And that is also why we are uneasy about passing judgment on another man's beliefs; we are fearful of showing some disrespect to his dignity as a human being.

This sensitivity to the dignity of another man's person is indispensable to the democratic way of life. Without it our civilization would collapse. For that reason it is very important that we keep it alive and healthy. And yet unless we are intelligent about the respect we accord to one another we shall as surely destroy freedom as we should if we were to lose our sensitiveness to the essential dignity of man. What many of us sensitive liberals fail to see is that freedom entails responsibilities. Of course we should grant freedom to men to arrive at their own belief, but by the same token of good faith we should hold them responsible for making those beliefs as reasonable as possible and accountable for the consequences of their acceptance of the beliefs. Moreover, and this is the point I am most eager to make, he who claims the right to freedom and tolerance must share the responsibility of preserving the conditions within which freedom and tolerance can be effectively realized and maintained.

Consider the remark made by the Roman Catholic cleric, Louis Veuillot: "We ask you for liberty in the name of your principles; we deny it to you in the name of ours." Here you see we have a man who insists upon freedom to destroy the very conditions of freedom, a man who while enjoying the privileges of a free society has no intention of accepting the responsibilities of preserving it. He is impudent and shameless about it.

The question arises: Should we refrain from pronouncing an adverse judgment upon a man like Veuillot? Some of us liberals who have not considered the limits and conditions of tolerance would, lest we seem intolerant. Others of us, on the other hand, would not hesitate for one moment to do so. Unless a man is willing to accept the responsibilities of freedom he should not be permitted to enjoy its privileges, we would say. We would agree with Dr. Arthur E. Murphy that to grant such a man freedom in the name of tolerance "is to exhibit not supernormal liberality and virtue but subnormal social intelligence."

It is upon these grounds that we pass judgment upon the recent pronouncements and the newly adopted strategy of the American Roman Catholic hierarchy. We believe that this hierarchy represents a culture historically alien to American institutions and that if it is successful in the achievement of its avowed mission we shall lose all the freedoms we have taken so much for granted.

Please note that I said hierarchy, not Roman Catholics. There is a difference. Of course it is not a hard and fast difference. Every Catholic layman, however innocent he may be of his church's intentions, must bear some degree of responsibility for what his church is and does.

Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen, author, lecturer, and educator at the Catholic University of America, who this year gave a series of Lenten talks on the Catholic Hour, gave one a year ago in which he discussed the wisdom of working toward the union of churches. In this talk he served notice to the Jews and the Protestants that there can be no religious unity save as they

renounce their faiths and unite with the Church of Rome. "A Union of Churches," he said, "does violence to history. Our Blessed Lord said to Peter, whose name He changed to *the Rock:* 'Upon this rock, I will build my Church.' He did not say: 'I will build my Churches.'" The ordinary Catholic layman believes this implicitly.

The ordinary Catholic layman also believes implicitly the statement I found in a Catholic Information column: "You see, Mrs. Hartman, Christ once said to His Apostles, 'Who heareth you, heareth Me,' and thus gave to His Church authority to make laws for the spiritual welfare of the faithful. Therefore, in deliberately disobeying a Church law, we are deliberately disobeying God." Just what the acceptance of such beliefs means in terms of religious fanaticism, illiberality, and conflict, the ordinary Catholic is probably not aware; yet in spite of his ignorance of their consequences he must, in part at least, be held responsible for them. Ignorance is never a valid excuse. Morally a man is obligated to evaluate his beliefs in terms of their consequences and to make them as sensible and as humane as he can. Failure to do so is irresponsibility.

A good illustration of what obedience to the church as an institution does to the moral life of a man is that provided by the life of Monsignor John A. Ryan, head of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Monsignor Ryan is undoubtedly the most noted and influential Catholic in America. He is a man of many fine qualities. How many times have not the hearts of liberals leaped up whenever we have read of his courageous pronouncements on social issues. And yet, as Harold E. Fey, in his excellent series of articles in *The Christian Century* (1944-45), points out, if you will read his autobiographical book, *Social Doctrine in Action,* you will see that his life has been characterized by a series of moral retreats in which the welfare of mankind has been sacrificed to the interests of the church as an institution.

Monsignor Ryan was a member of the national board of the American Civil Liberties Union. He resigned in 1935. Why? "Simply and solely," he writes, "because the organization had gone into the field of academic freedom. I called attention to the absurdity of my membership on the national committee of an organization which might undertake to defend a professor at the Catholic University who has been discharged for teaching heresy." He likewise resigned from the board of the National Council for the Prevention of War. Why? Because the board "over my repeated protests," he writes, "decided to intervene in the controversy and conflict between the government of Mexico and the Catholic Church." He has opposed planned parenthood. Why? Because that is the official position of the Church. And so on. The story of Monsignor Ryan is the story that could be told of thousands of Roman Catholic laymen.

But whatever responsibility the Catholic layman must ultimately bear for the evils of his church as an institution, I do think that a practical distinction can be made between his spirituality and the activities of the church hierarchy. At least it is the latter to which I wish to draw your attention.

The ruling American hierarchy is composed of a body of 145 bishops and archbishops who are appointed directly by the pope. The pope keeps in close touch with them by means of the apostolic delegate whom he maintains in Washington. Thus far the apostolic delegate has always been an Italian. The American hierarchy and the millions of American Catholic laymen under them are thus under the control and surveillance of the Vatican. I do not think it is necessary for me to point out that the Vatican represents a culture historically alien to that of America and that so long as it dominates the American church, the American church will partake of its spirit.

Today the whole American hierarchy is infused by a new spirit of evangelism. Its purpose is to win the whole of America to "obedience to Rome." It may take a century to do this, but what is a century to a 2,000-year-old institution? I could illustrate this new spirit and intention by dozens of recent statements by Roman Catholic leaders. To bring it close to home I might cite Bishop Griffin of the Springfield diocese who declares, "We have 75,000,000 pagans in these United States," and who then goes on to state his method of converting America. I might cite the literature of the National Catholic Welfare Conference which states that "the chief aim in all the work with the laity is to train soldiers of Christ who in all their work, their unions, employers' organizations, farmers' associations, professional bodies, as also their life as citizens, will be apostles," and which ends with Pope Pius XI's words: "With the assistance of divine grace, the destiny of the human family is in our hands." I might cite recent books like that of the distinguished Catholic historian, Theodore Maynard, who in his *Story of American Catholicism* says: "Protestantism is now so doctrinally decayed as to be incapable of offering any serious opposition to the sharp Sword of the Spirit. Catholicism could cut through Protestantism as through so much butter," and who then urges a momentous Catholic effort in the United States.

But the utterance I wish especially to bring to your attention is Monsignor Ryan's book, *Catholic Principles in Politics.* This is a recent reprint of the book, *The State and the Church,* which Ryan wrote nearly twenty-five years ago. It is stamped with both the imprimatur and the *nihil obstat,* and has been an approved text in Catholic universities for over two decades. It therefore expresses the official Roman Catholic position on the relation of the Church to American society. Ryan tells us that the purpose of the Church in America is to establish itself as the state church, that since the Church of Rome is the one true church the state is obliged to help it to attain its end. He discusses methods of attaining this end, such as compelling representatives of the government to attend its important functions. Apparently this is already being done. For example, at the recent consecration of M. J. Ready as bishop of Columbus, Ohio, four federal cabinet secretaries, a number of congressmen, representatives of the army and navy, and ambassadors and representations of nine foreign countries, were present.

Ryan is even kind enough to tell us what will happen to the other religious faiths when Catholicism becomes the state religion. They will be permitted to exist, he tells us, only if "carried on within the family circle or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful." He then gives us the logic of his position. "Since no rational end is promoted by the dissemination of false

doctrine, there exists no right to indulge in this practice. Error has not the same rights as truth."

Will not the Protestants and the liberals rise up in arms and prevent the Catholics from doing what they want to do? No, says Ryan, Protestants and liberals are obliged by their adherence to religious freedom and tolerance to permit the Catholics to do what they want to do—which, of course, the Protestants and the liberals will do unless they show more intelligence than they have thus far about the limits and conditions of tolerance. Once the Church has come into power the handling of other churches will be relatively easy. Catholicism, says Ryan, will see to it that they are taxed out of existence. The Catholic Church will, of course, as the state church, be exempt from taxation. What if the state refuses to do this? Then, says Ryan, the pope can free Catholics from their oath of allegiance to it. As it is, Catholics are obliged to obey the constitution only until they have power enough to change it.

How many times have I not heard liberals say that Ryan is a great democrat! Let them read his book, a document which is hardly less incredible than Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. But what is true of the essential un-Americanism, the intolerance, the illiberality of this leading Roman Catholic spokesman is true of the other members of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. I should welcome any evidence to the contrary.

But, you say, the illiberal aims of these men are fantastic; they cannot possibly be carried out. Perhaps. What I have thus far aimed to do is to show you the spirit which informs present-day American Catholicism and to indicate how alien it is to American culture. As to whether or not it can achieve what it wants to achieve in America, it is worth-while to note that it has been successful elsewhere. Take the matter of suppressing other faiths. Surely we all know that when Italy overran Ethiopia, which by no stretch of the imagination can be called a Catholic country, it was made a protected preserve for Roman Catholic missionaries; that the Vatican excommunicated all who had anything to do with the writing of the constitution of the Spanish republic and that when Franco became dictator in Spain, the Protestant churches there were annihilated; that under the new Fascist regime in Argentina some Protestant churches have already been closed.

It would be a sad mistake to assume that the professed intentions of the American hierarchy have not progressed beyond words. In fact they are implemented by the most marvelous machinery we can imagine. Today, for the first time in American history, the Catholics of America, some 23,000,000 of them, act as a unit. This feat has been achieved through the National Catholic Welfare Conference which carries on its activities in its spacious office building on Massachusetts Avenue in Washington. This organization came to birth following World War I, and has developed into its present greatness largely through the efforts of Monsignor John A. Ryan. It is under the direct supervision and control of the American hierarchy, although ultimately responsible to the pope. Through it the hierarchy has organized all its forces for the winning of America to Catholicism. There is the Education Department, the Press Department, the Social Action Department, the Rural Life Department, the Legal Department. Also heading up in the National Catholic Welfare Conference are organizations like the National Council of Catholic Men, the League of Decency, the National Catholic Youth Council, the National Catholic Community Service. Let us briefly consider the activities of these agencies and departments and note how they are undermining the essential conditions of our democratic society.

First, the Education Department. This department is not only the focal point of the 7,647 parochial schools, the 769 Catholic colleges and universities, and the 193 Catholic seminaries, in America, but also the place where the Catholic attack upon the public schools is planned. Read the recently published book *Public Enemy No. 1,* by Bishop John F. Noll, an officer of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, to learn what the Catholics think of our public educational system. Public Enemy No. 1 is, of course, the public school. This department also lobbies in the state legislatures and in congress for legislation favorable to Catholic education. Perhaps one example of its lobbying will suffice, the blocking of a bill, sponsored by the National Education Association, to provide federal aid for public schools. This bill was opposed by the Catholic lobby because it did not provide aid for parochial schools, aid which if granted would destroy the public school system as we know it.

Take next the Press Department which the bishops and archbishops of America founded and control. It is one of the major news-gathering agencies of the country. Many of us have little conception of the circulation and influence of the Catholic press. In 1942 its publications had a total circulation of nine million, which was a thirty per cent increase over the circulation in 1932. Now if the Catholic hierarchy would minister to its own people through its press and not molest other newspapers, there would be little to be disturbed about, but this it refuses to do. Here as in all other areas of our culture the Catholic leaders insist upon interfering with the liberties of others. For example, do you know that they silenced the newspapers on the Spanish Civil War as effectively as if it had been done by the Gestapo? Ask any newspaper editor.

The misconduct of any Protestant minister appears on the front page of newspapers, but have you ever seen any newspaper item on the misconduct of a priest? What happens to a newspaper when it dares to print such an item is illustrated by the treatment accorded to the *San Francisco News* several months ago. Against the efforts of Catholics to stop it, the *News* printed the story of a priest who was arrested for drunken driving and who at the time of his arrest had a woman companion with him. At once the Catholics organized a boycott of the paper. This was headed by Archbishop Mitty, a member of the board governing the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who described the paper as "antagonistic" and "bigoted." Quite obviously this prelate values a subservient press more than he does one that is free.

This incident is so typical that today few newspapers will handle news which will in any way adversely affect their relations with the Church. Thus we are deprived of the means of getting the whole truth about Catholics and their activities. It is about as hard to get it as it would be to learn what any Catholic

bishop is worth financially, which is impossible, for he is a corporation unto himself, an autocratic economic entity, from whom no public auditing of accounts is required. But the most serious result is the effect upon the essential conditions of a free press. Though only a minority, the Catholics are succeeding in undermining those conditions.

Every autocrat and every authoritarian institution is hypersensitive to criticism. The Catholic Church is no exception. Consequently it has developed its own press to treat the news as it best sees fit. But it also uses its press for other ends. About two years ago the Catholic hierarchy demanded the recall of all Protestant missionaries from South America. At once the Catholic Press Department went into action. By means of its services throughout the United States and Latin America it carried on a vigorous campaign to achieve its end. How amazingly successful the Catholics have been with our State Department and the ministries of Latin American countries in achieving their objective is told by Samuel Guy Inman in a recent issue of *The New Republic*.

Or note how successfully the National Catholic Welfare Conference has used its press in its campaign to censor and control Hollywood moving pictures. The story is told with much pride in one of its pamphlets. Every Catholic paper in America and in twenty-one other countries where American films are shown took up the campaign simultaneously and demanded of Catholics that they exert their pressure upon Hollywood. The rest of the story is found in the numerous pro-Catholic films which Hollywood is now producing. One of my fellow Unitarian ministers, the Reverend Harold Marley of Dayton, Ohio, recently gave a talk on ten recent pro-Catholic Hollywood pictures. I have, incidentally, been interested in the remarks which various persons have made to me about the picture "Going My Way." The substance of these remarks has been: "But after all the Catholic Church isn't so bad. Surely you wouldn't let a little thing like the use of the clerical collar prejudice you against it." Obviously the value of such pictures to the Church is great.

Just how Catholic censorship of films operates was brought out by a letter which George Bernard Shaw wrote several years ago to the *New York Times* in protest against the attempted Catholic censorship of the film version of his famous play "St. Joan." This is aside from the Press Department of the Catholic Welfare Conference but I think it is worth-while to mention it here. Catholic Action demanded many serious changes in the scenario and threatened, if they were not made, to have the millions of American Catholics boycott the film. During the controversy, the whole inside show of Catholic censorship was given away when it was reported that Mr. Breen, a Catholic layman associated with Mr. Hays of the Motion Pictures Producers, passes on projected screen productions and that questions of what is suitable for filming are often settled unofficially to prevent a record from being made. I bring this matter of Catholic censorship of films up because it is another illustration of how Catholics are interfering with the liberties of others and are undermining the essential conditions of a free, democratic society. They attempt to censor all types of art, not merely for the Catholics themselves, but for all the people. They do this in terms of a religion which the majority of the people are not prepared to accept.

The other departments of the National Catholic Welfare Conference must be dealt with still more hurriedly. There is the Rural Life Department which is the focal point for a national system of diocesan rural life bureaus. The department does much good work, but here too the aim is to win America for Catholicism. The head of the department points out that since "1000 rural people will have six times as many progeny a century hence as 1000 city people," the Church must during the coming century concentrate its efforts on the winning of rural America to Catholicism. The directors of the diocesan bureaus are asked to get into all cooperative and social movements so as to direct them into "proper Christian channels."

Then there is the Social Action Department, headed by Monsignor Ryan. This department is at present promoting the Vatican's "Program for Social Reconstruction." Catholics become angry when the plan is described as Fascist, and yet in substance that is what it is. It is more politely called the "corporative state." The department is also actively engaged in winning the industrial worker to Catholicism. Catholics already dominate unions and have convinced a large portion of the workers that the Church is on the side of the exploited. Of course some labor leaders are disturbed by their activities, especially the activities of the Catholic Trades Unionists. This Catholic organization works within the unions in many of our big cities. It exercises much influence upon labor leaders and by undemocratic methods tries to formulate the policies of the unions. Yet in spite of the criticisms, the activities of the Catholics are bearing fruit. Note how much in evidence is the clerical collar at labor conventions.

The efforts of the Church to control family life in America also stem from the Social Action Department. The success of its efforts and those of the hierarchy is witnessed in the defeat of the Child Labor Amendment in various state legislatures and in preventing the establishment of maternal health clinics. It is the same old story of a minority blocking the will of the majority and muzzling democratic action and free discussion.

Then there is the Legal Department which scrutinizes all national legislation and gives counsel to Catholic leaders concerning bills which appear before any of the 48 state legislatures. It has been called "the most powerful lobby in America." Its list of recent achievements is imposing, many of which are startling in their implications.

Heading up in the National Catholic Welfare Conference are the war service agencies of the Church. Among their many activities is missionary work among non-Catholic servicemen. All of us, I am sure, are aware of the fact that these activities are being spotlighted, especially the activities of men like Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, "military vicar of army and navy chaplains." It is interesting in this connection to note that the chief of chaplains of the army, the head of the chaplains' placement office, and the commandant of the chaplains' training school are all Roman Catholics.

There are many other agencies which I have not mentioned. Including those I have brought to your

attention they represent every aspect of our American culture and are all neatly meshed with the general power mechanism which has its American center in Washington, a mechanism which is geared to the winning of America to Catholicism.

Can Catholicism win America? The answer is: It can. In fact, it has already gone far in doing so. America, let us remember, is not simply a geographical area with so many inhabitants. It is also an idea, a way of life, whose continued existence rests upon the preservation of certain conditions. It is these conditions which are being attacked and successfully undermined by the activities of the totalitarian church. It is high time that we awaken to this situation and rise to the defense of our liberties. To be sure, we must continue to try to work with Roman Catholics. It is discouraging, I know. When we wanted representatives of three major religious groups to take part in Brotherhood Week observances in our Bloomington church, the local priests informed us they could not do so without the consent of their bishop. We wrote to the bishop but he failed to answer the letter. Still, in spite of these rebuffs, we must continue to hold out an open hand.

But in addition to the open hand we must insist upon bringing the whole subject of Catholicism out in the open and encourage the fullest discussion of it. We must organize to resist all attempts on the part of the Catholics to boycott and blackmail and coerce. We must learn, in short, to interpret the conditions of tolerance intelligently and to assert ourselves against those who would take advantage of our liberality to destroy the very conditions to which liberalism owes its existence. If we can do that, our fight against the threat of Catholicism to America will be more than half won.

Appeasement and Jewish Emancipation

DAVID M. BLOCH

For quite a number of years there has been a marked tendency on the part of American Jews to shun honest self-criticism. Let anyone, particularly a Jew, no matter how noble his motives or sound his judgment, point out some of his people's faults and he runs the risk of being placed among the "untouchables."

The usual alibi given for this hyper-sensitivity to censure of any kind is that it only encourages the anti-Semites to intensify their "hate campaign" against the Jew. In the light of what he has already suffered, and surrounded as he is by enemies on all sides, it is no time for self-chastisement, argue the "well-wishers" of Israel.

But this hush-hush policy sets a dangerous precedent. No intelligent approach to the Jewish problem is possible under such circumstances. A true revelation of Jewish shortcomings, whether it comes from a Gentile or Jew, provided, of course, it is offered in the right spirit, should be most welcome. No nation can very well afford to hide its defects. Figuratively speaking, constructive criticism is like fresh blood plasma injected into the atrophic parts of a national organism. Only through such an injection can a sick people become aware of its malady, and by taking the proper precautions be eventually restored to health.

Let us make clear at the outset, however, that it is not chiefly the vices of the Jew with which we are here concerned. God knows the rest of mankind has more than its share of vices. It is the appeasing program in general that the Jews have adopted as a means of survival; this constant handling with silk gloves of their own as well as Christian wrongdoers is the central target of our attack.

To be sure there were Jews at various periods in history who for the sake of expediency were quite ready to overlook or minimize the wrongs of their day or the injustices perpetrated against their people. Very seldom, however, did the entire Jewish community resort to appeasement as a way out of their difficulties. In critical times when the life of the nation was at stake or spiritual values were on the decline, inspired leaders who commanded an influential following would arise to defy the Principalities of Darkness. The prophets, the Maccabeans, Simon bar Giora, Bar Kochba, Theodore Herzel, Moses Hess, Nordau, Gershuni—to mention but a few illustrious names throughout the long, tragic exile of the Jews.

But where are the great leaders, the crusading movements among the Jews today to make them conscious of their moral obligations and unite them against the common foe? Never have the appeasers been so triumphant. Never have the appeasers played such a prominent rôle in the life of the nation and met with so little opposition.

All through the dark and bloody years of Hitler's rule, when the worst outrages ever committed against a people were inflicted upon them, there was no effective organized protest at any time on the part of world Jewry.

Most of the Jews who were fortunate enough to escape the Nazi terror, share no small part of the guilt in the wholesale massacre of their European brethren. Had they raised their voices a bit louder, protested more vigorously against the savage acts wreaked upon Jews and radical-liberal elements in general, when the brown-shirted fanatics started their stampede against civilization; had they mustered all the forces at their command to combat anti-Semitism wherever it raised its ugly head, there is no question that many of the horrors imposed upon their unfortunate co-religionists could have been prevented.

Instead of a muffled cry for help there should have come forth a roaring voice of denunciation; instead of begging on bended knee, strong demands for rescue should have been made upon the Christian world that is so much indebted to them spiritually.

The timidity and fear exhibited by the Jews here in America was their undoing. The professed followers of Christ who hold the seats of power in Washington and London, refused to intervene because they surmised that those who espoused the Jewish cause were also appeasers at heart and their pleas therefore were not to be taken seriously. These Machiavellian diplomats, whatever else they may be, are no fools. They

knew very well that most of the influential Jews in the democratic lands would not dare to pry too deeply into the Inner Sanctum of their tricky diplomacy and hold them accountable for their shameless traffic with the enemy of mankind.

Nor is there any sign that American Jewry has in any way repented and is ready to turn a new leaf. For the most part they are still playing the old familiar game of appeasement. Now that the Nazis have finally been defeated and the remaining scattered European Jews, battered and starved, are clamoring for help, are their kinsmen in this country doing anything for them? Oh, yes, they hold meetings, pass resolutions, and dispatch their glorified, prosperous attorneys and amiable optimistic rabbis to Washington to present their grievances before the very same Christian appeasers who throughout all these fateful years managed so skillfully to evade the entire Jewish issue.

The result of all these maneuvers is that nothing of course ever materializes. Those past masters of evasion in our State Department are not so easily to be caught off guard. They receive the representative Jews very cordially, promise as usual to look into the matter and quickly forget about the whole unpleasant business the moment that the self-satisfied Jewish leaders' backs are turned.

That is precisely what took place also at the World Conference at San Francisco. The diplomats seemed to be interested in every problem but that of the Jew. The Jewish delegates who came uninvited to plead their cause went away without having accomplished anything worth-while.

And so the tragic farce goes on. The destitute Jews are left to shift for themselves while their would-be benefactors go on making futile gestures to rescue them.

The truth of the matter is that the more favorably situated Jews will never be able to either lighten the burden of those of their faith in distress, or effectively to combat anti-Semitism, which is still a threat not only in Europe but here in America as well, if they go on courting opportunism and wading in the stagnant waters of a crass materialism.

It is time that American Jewry awaken from its stupor and realize that its self-appointed, influential leaders, in taking the road of least resistance by way of appeasement, are only leading them up a blind alley. Unless a new, dynamic leadership arises that will take a firm, decisive stand against unscrupulous members of their race as well as Jew-baiting and reaction in general, it will not be possible to cope adequately with the numerous Jewish problems pressing for a solution.

If the race, that is, what is left of it, is to survive as a creative unit in the family of nations, the Jews must once and for all shake off the banal influence of bourgeois complacency and pseudo-liberalism. To deal effectively with their enemies will require all the ingenuity and daring that the race can muster. Only an uncompromising idealism can save the Jew in this most tragic hour of his history. Once again the Jewish people will have to become the impassioned crusaders of a new and better world for all mankind if they are to survive; if they are to justify their present and future existence as a nation.

That is the Jew's historic mission whether he likes it or not. The martyrs in the Warsaw ghetto understood it only too well when, with a prayer on their lips and a curse in their hearts for their oppressors, they heroically gave their lives so that freedom might endure.

They and the many other noble and gifted men and women of Jewish origin, who in every age have held high the torch of liberty, will have lived in vain if their descendants do not carry on in the same vein; if they go on instead embracing the gospel of expediency; if they persist, as many American Jews do, in clinging tenaciously to their policy of appeasement.

The Jew has been altogether too long on the defensive. Too long has he extolled his virtues and apologized for his vices in order to persuade the world that he, too, was entitled to live freely without being molested.

The apologetics, however, will continue to sound on deaf ears. He should be convinced by now that his enemies are not interested in either his qualities or faults. They simply want no part of him, good, bad, or otherwise. That may be a bitter pill to swallow; but swallow it he must. No form of escapism will do.

Is it not a fact that even some of the most enlightened leading liberal Gentiles, who outwardly show no sign of anti-Semitic bias, hope that through assimilation they may finally be able to rid themselves of the Jew.

As for the sincere Christian friends—Reinhold Niebuhr, Pierre Van Paassen, Karl M. Chworowsky, and others like them whose *Weltanschauung* reflects to a considerable degree the prophetic Hebraic spirit—how can these men be expected to continue their tireless efforts in behalf of the Jews when in the common battle against anti-Semitism the latter refuse to face reality, admit their shortcomings, and stand up like men to assert their rights.

It cannot be reiterated too often that no people's individual and collective security can ever be attained by avoiding the truth, by repudiating basic principles. Long experience should have taught the Jew he can thrive only in a liberated world, free from the scourges of war, free from oppression and greed. It is imperative, therefore, that he dedicate his life toward making this dream come true.

This by no means implies that in championing the cause of humanity the Jews must necessarily ignore their own national aspirations. Palestine, once the cradle of their civilization, must again become, as indeed in a limited way it is already, the cultural and spiritual center of their creative life. They must bring to bear constant pressure on Great Britain that she live up to the Balfour Declaration. How much longer will they be satisfied with vague promises? It is high time that these promises be fulfilled. For that matter the Jew has a justifiable claim not only against England, but the entire Christian world to consummate its sacred obligation and to see to it that the gates of Palestine be opened not only to a select number from the stricken lands, but to all Jews who may desire to settle there.

Needless to say, Palestine will not be able to solve the entire Jewish problem. Even if all the Jews were anxious to make their home there, the restricted area of that country would not permit it. Besides, the Jew has become too integrated a part of humanity as a whole. Culturally and in other ways he belongs not only to the country in which he was born or has become a permanent resident, but to the world.

Therefore, the Jew if he is to be true to himself and develop his latent powers must persist in maintaining his basic rights in whatever land he resides and be active in every movement, Christian or non-Christian, that aims to establish a better, more humane society.

That may sound like a large order; but it is well to remember that there is no short cut to the promised

land for either Gentile or Jew. A people to remain creatively alive must have a special mission or task to perform, a special contribution to make to civilization. The Jews' mission assigned to them by Destiny long ago is to be disciples of moral excellence. To deny the validity of this calling, to refuse to accept its obligations, is to repudiate all that the Jewish race has upheld for more than two thousand years. It is to make the term "Jew" utterly meaningless. In the undying words of one of their great prophets: "What does the Lord require of thee but to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God."

The Study Table

Complex Problem

THE WINDS OF FEAR. *By Hodding Carter. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. $2.50.*

This is a novel which raises a problem, but does not answer it. Yet that is no sin, for there is no simple answer to this complex problem: How can racism be eradicated in the South?

Hodding Carter, the author, is a native of Louisiana. He sets the story in his native South, in a small town called Carvell City. In Chapter I a Northern Negro and the town's white marshal both get killed, and in the last chapter of the book a Southern Negro and the town's white marshal get killed. Not much progress, but a swift-moving story in between with an obvious understanding of the South.

The two important figures in the book are a militant Negro doctor who finds himself thrown out of town and the increasingly-militant son of the white newspaper editor, who wants to throw himself out of town—in frustration. And these two characters face the Southern problem: How can the militant Negro be militant and yet be alive in the small southern town? And how can the militant white be militant (southern style) and yet be effective in the small southern town? The temptations for them both lie up North. Yet the need for them both remains in the South.

Although the tragedy that is the South is the product of white man's blunderings, a few of the Negro characters in this particular story do not help much to avert this tragedy. The Quarter's bootlegger is a white man's Negro. So is the Quarter's preacher who "didn't believe in walking into the Lion's Den, even if the Lord was on your side." The Negro professor, though an Uncle Tom, is the only person in the book to grow, except perhaps the newspaper editor, who is pulled along by his son more than he grows.

This is not a great novel, but it is one of those books which makes one wonder what the war is all about, where the real enemy lies. This book makes the Northerner want to go down to the Carvells of the South, despite almost certain lynch-law. One comfort, though. This book makes it plain that racism is so rampant in the South that, though a Northerner might interfere, he cannot make it worse!

As the author says, the winds of fear are rushing today principally through the South. But the citizen of the North must keep a weathered eye for the tornadoes in Detroit and the cyclones which might still come to Chicago.

HOMER A. JACK.

Lanny Budd's Program

DRAGON HARVEST. *By Upton Sinclair. New York: Viking Press. $3.00.*

This is the latest of the remarkable Lanny Budd series of contemporary historical novels. The story has now reached its sixth large volume, and the forty-three hundred and thirty-ninth page, and shows no sign of stopping. This is all right with me — I only hope that the tale may go on as long as I live! I have read no more fascinating books in my time, and regard the series in itself as one of the great literary performances of the present day. In this judgment I am so fortunate as to be in accord with such men as Thomas Mann, Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells.

Lanny Budd is of course one of the most familiar characters in modern literature, and his wanderings in Europe and America and his acquaintanceship with the great and near-great in this tragic era are like a chapter right out of history itself. In the last book, *Presidential Agent,* Lanny became the friend and confidant of President Roosevelt, and fell into the dramatic and highly dangerous position of serving as his "agent" or private observer and reporter, while maintaining his close contacts with Hitler, Goering and Hess in Nazi Germany. In this book, he continues this dual relationship. The story begins just before Munich,

(*Continued on page* 111)

The Field

(*Continued from page* 98)

cation course. Consequently, he was required by the public school officials to sit in the school corridor while this course was being given. Other pupils in the school, noticing him, assumed he was being punished and he was treated with ridicule for supposed bad conduct. The child urged his mother to give him permission to take the religious education course so that he could conform to the conduct and participate in the activities of fellow pupils.

The Interchurchmen's Council has added several thousand dollars to its budget to support this legal fight. The Church Federation of Greater Chicago and the Illinois Church Council are forming special committees to raise funds and employ counsel to assist the School Board in defending against this suit. These church groups have already raised thousands of dollars. Down-state newspapers have featured the case as having potential significance exceeding the evolution (Scopes) case of Tennessee in 1925.

The Chicago Civil Liberties Committee appeals to its members and the public for special contributions to the Committee's Religious Liberty Fund. The Committee seeks to raise $10,000 to maintain religious freedom with separation of church and state, and to prosecute the McCollum case to a complete, fair and final decision. Send your checks and money orders today.

—*Civil Liberties News.*

The Study Table

(*Continued from page* 110)

and ends with the retreat from Dunkirk and Hitler's entrance into Paris. The last scene is that of the Fuehrer, in Lanny's presence, looking down upon the tomb of Napoleon. Our hero divides his time in these pages about equally between America, England, France, and Germany. It is needless to say that he knows all the great figures in these countries, and is present at all the terrific events which take place. This is quite in the tradition of historical fiction, and is sustained with a degree of plausibility which is little short of miraculous.

The general character of *Dragon Harvest* is much the same as that of the preceding volumes in the series. There are the usual meetings and interviews with the great political and business figures of the time — the quiet story of Lanny's family, with his mother, Beauty Budd, a still non-ending delight — the passing glimpses of the professional art world, with its pictures, exhibits, and commercial features—the depiction of spiritualism in its more innocent and also sordid phases — another love complication for Lanny, with one more thrilling escape from the Reich. All this and similar narrative material we have had before in these books. The wonder is that Mr. Sinclair can keep them fresh and steadily interesting. But this he does with a skill which is amazing. The seven hundred pages of this book flow like water — now smoothly and quietly, now tumultuously and excitingly. Like a boat caught in a swift current, the reader is swept along by the sheer momentum of a narrative which never flags for a single instant. Just as a feat of story-telling, this work is prodigious.

Added to this is the consummate art with which Mr. Sinclair combines history and fiction. One might think in this case that the history might swamp the fiction, or the fiction make trivial the history. It is easier to do this sort of thing when the scene is set some hundreds of years back into the past, where names and events are fading memories and not living realities of our own time. But Upton Sinclair is the easy master of his material. He weaves the two strands of history and fiction into a flawless pattern, in which each strand sustains and displays the other. This is a great achievement, which not even Wells nor Romaines has matched.

There are five crowded years between the close of this book and the present day. This is ample material for several more Lanny Budd books. I await their coming with eager impatience.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

Plan for Peace Between India and Britain

TO UNITY:

The much-heralded Simla conference for the reconstruction of the British Viceroy's executive council in India has ended in a fiasco. It looks like another glaring example of the habitual and conscious somnambulism of the British Government in India. So it now becomes the ethical duty of every friend of man to think of constructive plans for peace between India and Britain; especially because the Labor Party has just won, for years to come, the complete control of the British Government by a large majority. At long last the majority of 400,000,000 people of India has the moral right to expect a little democracy from the minority of the 45,000,000 people of Britain.

For the last forty-four long years I have been working with devotion under most trying conditions for the independence of my Motherland. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India's illustrious and heroic leader, was a baby of only two years in 1901, I had the honor of being initiated by Mahatma Asvini Kumar Dutt of Barisal, Bengal, into dedicating my life to the cause of India's Independence. I may, in all humility, admit that I have never turned my coat; nor have I ever lowered the flag of freedom we unfurled in Calcutta on the 16th of October, 1905, when Lord Curzon partitioned the Province of Bengal against the will of the people of India. This was the birthday of India's new nationalist movement.

India today faces a titanic economic and political crisis that may soon plunge mankind into another world war. Consequently I consider it both a national and a human duty to submit, under the present complex circumstances, a new plan for the serious consideration of the peoples and governments of India and Britain; and those of other nations of the world, especially America and Russia—the two most powerful nations on this planet today. I mention America and Russia in this connection primarily because impoverished Britain cannot any longer afford to ignore or to defy any joint demand from them. This is the most auspicious time for both President Truman of America and Marshal Stalin of Russia to jointly and decisively take up with Prime Minister Attlee of Britain the following plan for the immediate solution of the British problem in India.

I am proposing that without further suicidal delay, Britain unconditionally surrender the Government of India, both civil and military, not to the India of Gandhi, Jinnah, or Ambedkar; of Azad, Nehru, or Savarkar; but to a Committee of Five composed of one each from America, China, Russia, Sweden, and Turkey, to be nominated by the Governments of these five great nations. The members of this committee should be completely oblivious to the interests and intrigues and propagandas of their own countries; and devote themselves wholeheartedly to the creation of a new India of real democracy.

This Committee of Five should have the authority for five years to administer the educational, social, economic, political, and the military life of the 400,000,000 people of India in any way they choose and please and desire for the general welfare of India and the world; never forgetting, and ever remembering, the real and the enduring welfare of the people of Britain. Let my India of Buddha and Tagore, of Akbar and Guru Govind Singh refuse even to eat the food she so abundantly grows, before starving Britain of Shakespeare and Shelley, of Lord Bacon and Florence Nightingale is first insured her food. Let Britain's cruelty be by India's kindness paid!

Toward the end of the fifth year this International Committee in India should convene a constituent assembly of the people to adopt a model constitution for the Government of India distilling the best from the constitutions of all the nations on earth, and rejecting the worst in them all. Then a free and unfettered general election should be held for the inauguration of a National Government.

This International Committee of Five should, however, function as the Board of Advisors to the new Government of India. After another five years this International Advisory Committee should end its services in India. Its five members should be rewarded and pensioned most generously by the Government of grateful India for their services toward the resurrection of our beloved land.

Thus the people of occupied India can peacefully win their national independence from the domination of an alien nation; and the proud people of imperial Britain can save themselves the painful humiliation of a surrender to the people of India—their slaves for so many centuries. And again, the vast majority of the people of Britain herself can thus be made bloodlessly free from the fatal bondage of imperialism.

BASANTA KOOMAR ROY.

New York City, N. Y.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

Challenge

The Scientific Age has reached a new climax. The scientists have released a power that promises to revolutionize life as we know it. Civilization may now choose whether it will annihilate itself or progress to undreamed of splendor.

The disintegration of the steel tower in New Mexico also disintegrated the ivory towers of the scientists, the theologians, the economists, and the political theorists. Moral neutrality is no longer possible. The doctrinaire *isms* of theology and philosophy can no longer have meaning or significance. We are thrown back on much more fundamental questions. Shall human existence continue? Is human life important enough to us to help others to live?

The old controversies between Capitalism and Communism, Fascism and Socialism, between Theists and Humanists, between Sociologists and Physical Scientists pale into insignificance in the presence of the burning question of what are the ethical attitudes that will enable man to live together harmoniously!

There no longer is any doubt but that man can master the physical forces of his world and make them serve his purposes. But there is doubt as to whether man can master the psychological and emotional forces which control his actions.

H. G. Wells' statement that "civilization is a race between education and catastrophe" comes home to us with a new clarity and intensity. If education is to win this race it will have to be conceived as of far greater scope than has been accorded to it in the past. Ethical standards and moral values have become of supreme importance. Methods must be devised whereby every person, young and old, will have an understanding of the functional growth, significance, and application of these standards and values.

All religion today finds itself faced with the necessity of emphasizing basic principles of human relations. As never before, there is need for a sympathetic understanding of the ethical and moral insights and implications of all human cultures wherever they are found. The holier-than-thou attitude of superiority of culture, religion, economy, or social organization is no longer tenable. The primary question is: Can people live together peacefully?

Among those of us who have always tried to emphasize the value of human personality and harmonious social relations, it no longer suffices to pay lip service to these values. They must become a part of our living. This must begin at home. It means that our churches must become models of harmony and function. It means that differences of opinion within our churches and associations must be discussed in perfect frankness and with mutual respect. It means that any person or group of persons who use economic pressure, social position, political trickery, or ultimatums to impose their wishes upon others or to create disunity are not only traitors to the principles they ostensibly profess but also traitors to mankind.

One of our ministers has said that a Unitarian church should be a laboratory of democracy. It must be more than that. It must be a laboratory and a functioning production unit of harmonious, helpful living. It must prove that unity can be achieved through diversity, and that men can differ in backgrounds, training, and beliefs, yet live and work together in peace. This same spirit and practice must then be carried into our daily work, our community, and in our attitudes and relationships with other sectors and peoples of the globe. We must learn to understand and work together with all men of good will who are striving for the betterment of humanity.

Liberals have long been in the minority largely because of their insistence that the supreme test of character for both individuals and society is ethical conduct. This test has now become the most important thing in the world. We are challenged to preach and demonstrate the peace-giving power of ethical and moral living. This is so important and necessary that we dare not permit our personal whims, petty prejudices, or our economic and theological beliefs to interfere. The best that is within us must triumph over the lesser and the worst.

If civilized men determine to destroy each other, then, if there is anything left of our globe, it will remain for the remote and relatively safe savages once again to begin the long trek of human progress. However, I am convinced that it is possible for man to utilize the tremendous forces he has discovered for the progress of mankind—for a new and higher civilization. This can be done if men are willing to work as cooperatively and intensively in research and experimentation for the mastery of social forces as they have for the mastery of physical phenomena. It will also require a new purpose, the welfare of all mankind.

The choice and the challenge are clear. What are you doing to meet it? *R. S. H.*

Order your church and church school supplies through
THE WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE